

71. (Amended) The kit of claim 68, wherein the [anti-CCR antibody is specifically immunoreactive with a cell cycle regulatory (CCR)] p16 protein [comprising] has an amino acid sequence [selected] of SEQ ID No[s]. 2[, 4, and 6].

74. (Amended) The kit of claim 68, wherein the antibody [is a] is a Fab fragment.

76. (Amended) The kit of claim [76] 68, wherein the antibody is provided in a form suitable for detecting the cell cycle regulatory (CCR) protein in samples in cells.

77. (Amended) The preparation of claim [65] 11, wherein the [cell cycle regulatory (CCR)] p16 protein is [at least 90%] identical to [one of] SEQ ID No[s]. 2[, 4, or 6].

REMARKS

Claims 11, 58-77, and 79-82 constitute the pending claims in the present application. Claim 78 has been cancelled. Because the Examiner did not indicate in the Advisory Action that the previously submitted amendments have been entered, the amendments shown above indicate changes to the claims since the response filed March 20, 2000. These amendments are being made to expedite the prosecution of claims drawn to a commercially relevant embodiment. Applicants reserve the right to prosecute claims of similar or differing scope in subsequent applications. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the following remarks. Issues raised by the Examiner will be addressed below in the order they appear in the prior Office Action.

Claims 11, 58-61, and 65-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Skolnick, et al. In the previous responses, Applicants have contended that the claimed subject matter is entitled to a filing date preceding that of Skolnick et al., thereby obviating this rejection. In the Advisory Action, the Examiner indicated that claims to antibodies specific for p16 would be entitled to such a filing date, and Applicants have amended the pending claims accordingly. Thus, Applicants submit that the claims as pending are supported by the specification of priority document 08/154,915, and thus Skolnick is unavailable as a reference

with respect to these claims. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 11 and 58-78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Skolnick, et al. For the reasons outlined above, Applicants submit that the amendments presented herein render this rejection moot. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 65, 77, and 78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicants have amended and/or cancelled these claims, thereby rendering the Examiner's rejection moot. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration is respectfully solicited. The Examiner may address any questions raised by this submission to the undersigned at 617-951-7000. Should an extension of time be required, Applicants hereby petition for same and request that the extension fee and any other fee required for timely consideration of this submission be charged to **Deposit Account No. 18-1945**.

Respectfully Submitted,



David P. Halstead
Reg. No. 44,735

Date: May 24, 2001

Customer No: 28120
Docketing Specialist
Ropes & Gray
One International Place
Boston, MA 02110